

Remarks

Claims 1-2 have been rejected and the drawings have been objected to.

In response to the claim rejections arguments have been provided and the claims have been amended.

In response to objections to the drawings, the specification has been amended, and new, amended drawings have been submitted that lack objectionable numbering.

Reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

In response to an objection that "there is multiple drawing figures which are duplicate" a complete new set of drawings is provided that has only one distinct figure per drawing and without duplicated figures, drawing numbers, or drawing headings. Figures 13, 14, 17 and 18 have been removed. A reference to these Figures on page 84 have been removed. Removal of the objection is requested.

In response to an objection that Figures 2, 8, 15 and 16 include "reference character(s) not mentioned in the description," the reference characters have been removed from these figures. Removal of the objection is requested.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

In response to an objection to the specification, on page 3, top of the office action, a paragraph has been added to the end of the brief description of the drawings section for Figure 19A-19C. Removal of this objection courteously is solicited.

REJECTION ON DOUBLE PATENTING GROUNDS

On page 3 of the office action, the claims have been provisionally rejected on alleged double patenting grounds under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant notes that claims in the other application are pending and will address this potential issue when claims are allowed from either application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Shimizu. Applicant notes that Shimizu shows and describes (in the abstract) alternative control signal transmission paths. On the other hand, pending claims 1 and 2 recite two or more power circuits (not lower current control circuits that control power circuits). While Shimizu does show or describe (in the translated abstract) two or more control circuits, Shimizu does not show or describe (in the abstract) two or more power circuits. Instead, one power circuit is shown in the figure of Shimizu, while the Shimizu abstract mentions multiple control circuitry.

In this context, applicant points out that claim 1 recites "electromagnetic and electrical interference" between circuits. Such power circuit interactions, and particularly the existence of multiple power circuits that may interact, is not described in the abstract of Shimizu, or the other references. In order to particularly point out and distinctly claim this feature, claim one has been amended by the addition of "provide power to the at least one or more motor and/or generator."

To make it clear that the invention claimed in claim 2 also includes this feature, the phrase "to substantially eliminate electromagnetic and electrical interference" has been added to claim 2.

Reconsideration and allowance are requested because none of the references describe or necessarily include the element of substantial lack of electromagnetic and electrical interference between two or more power circuits, as recited in amended claims 1 and 2.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The claims have been rejected on obviousness grounds in view of Shimizu and others. However, as described above, none of the references, either alone or in combination describe separate power circuits that are independently isolated with regards to electromagnetic and electrical interference. Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

In view of the foregoing, and in summary, claims 1-2 are considered to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, respectfully is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and remarks, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all objections and rejections and issuance of a notice of allowance. The Examiner courteously is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for applicant at 202-912-2195 for any reason related to the advancement of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/07/05

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
1717 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-4004
Telephone: (202) 912-2000
Facsimile: (202) 912-2020



Marvin Motsenbocker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 36,614

Customer No. 26633